

COT MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, December 6, 2013

12:30 PM - 2:45 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

CONFERENCE ROOM 119

MEMBERS PRESENT

Scott Bales, *Chair*
Randolph Bartlett*
Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Raymond Billotte (*Phil Knox, proxy*)
Bennett Evan Cooper
Michael Jeanes (*Cathy Clarich, proxy*)
Diane Johnsen
Gary Krcmarik*
John Rezzo
Roxanne Song Ong (*Jennifer Gilbertson, proxy*)
Thomas Schoaf
Delcy Scull
Virlynn Tinnell
Garye Vasquez (*Michael Miller*, proxy*)

GUESTS

Beth Schaffer*, *Maricopa OET*
Michael Pollard*, *CACC*

MEMBERS ABSENT

John Lucas

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Eric Ciminski, *CSD*
Melba Davidson, *ASD*
Melinda Hardman, *CSD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Pamela Peet, *ITD*
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *CSD*
Jason Shumberger, *ITD*
Amy Wood, *CSD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Hon. Scott Bales, Chair

Vice Chief Justice Scott Bales, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. He welcomed members and guests then called the roll. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

Justice Bales noted the schedule of meeting dates for 2014 and encouraged members to reserve the dates listed to avoid conflicts. He also informed members that the FY2015 to 2019 strategic agenda for the courts will be considered by the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) next week. He praised the ad hoc subteam for taking a truly strategic view in evaluating and commenting on the content of the draft plan.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2013 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 13-20

ELECTRONIC RECORDS RETENTION AND DESTRUCTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

Mr. Marcus
Reinkensmeyer

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, chair of the Electronic Records Retention and Destruction (ERR&D) Advisory Committee, reviewed the committee's history and the six recommendations contained in the final report to be presented to presiding judges and AJC on December 11 and 12, respectively.

In response to questions from the chair and members Marcus shared details about two items of controversy the committee worked to resolve and Melinda Hardman reviewed current retention periods provided in the applicable code sections and administrative orders. Staff member Stewart Bruner added that the review of current retention schedules was not in the charge to the committee. Melinda volunteered to collect members' issues with retention schedules to add to a superior court clerks' proposal that is currently being reviewed.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommendations of the ERR&D advisory committee, including a 24-month implementation period, with the understanding that any court rule or administrative code changes to enact the recommendations will follow the normal comment and approval processes. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 13-21

INFRASTRUCTURE AND CLIENT TECHNOLOGY REFRESH

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, Chief Information Officer (CIO) for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), reminded members of the various factors driving the upcoming ACAP technology refresh using new hardware, Windows 8.1, and corresponding productivity software. He

outlined the various decisions that have already been made as well as those still in process. Infrastructure items are being included to enable the software distribution efficiencies required for the HP PCs being purchased to remain in the field for 7 or 8 years. New operating system releases enable a “cloud” storage option to make data available across various devices of the same user and more survivable in a local disaster.

Karl relayed various experiences he’s heard from peers adopting Windows 8 across the country and described the challenges posed by Microsoft’s various licensing models/prices for Office products. Work is underway to prepare the first round of machines for certification with statewide applications followed local IT staff testing of local applications early next year. County IT leaders are being informed of the implications of the direction on county-owned machines, especially ones used in adult probation departments. Karl plans to use AOC as the pilot site and make course corrections for the nine-month statewide rollout based on lessons learned there.

INCREASING CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl shared a presentation he had just given to the COJET committee highlighting the importance of regular awareness training in our increasingly interconnected branch. The “consumerization” of IT presents special challenges to court security as mobile devices connect to the court network and employees use Dropbox and other document sharing facilities outside the court network. Perimeter protections are necessary but not sufficient to protect court data from being leaked and court machines from being compromised. Karl pointed out that employees form the vital last line of protection against attacks but currently have little understanding of the schemes used to dupe them into aiding attackers. Vigilance has become so vital that he has recommended modification of the COJET code section to add cyber security awareness as an annual requirement like ethics. The chair suggested that cyber security be specifically included in any new employee orientation.

E-COURT SERVICES UPDATE

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

Marcus Reinkensmeyer provided up-to-the minute status on the e-filing solution, access to electronic case documents and data, and the pilot of the judge automation tool. Marcus reviewed the specific enhancements made to AZTurboCourt in October including enabling multiple lead documents and addressing the change in jurisdictional amount for small claims. He shared the volume of electronic service being purchased with filings and acknowledged the value of a rule change for mandatory consent to receipt of electronic service by AZTurboCourt users. Marcus previewed an upcoming release to add participant matching at Pima Superior Court that would empower mandatory civil e-filing there.

Mike Baumstark updated members on the recent settlement of the intellectual property dispute with Intresys. He reviewed the practical implications of that settlement for next generation e-filing, most notably the potential for another e-filing system to be used in the rural counties as well as for processing other case types in Maricopa and Pima counties before June 1, 2015. After June 1, 2015, the multi-vendor model originally envisioned by the e-Court Committee could be implemented. Bennett Cooper emphasized the Arizona State Bar’s perspective that each court

COT MEETING MINUTES

must not be allowed to select a separate e-filing system. Mike stated that AZTurboCourt will now be available to users through May 31, 2019.

The eAccess project has recently been focusing on certification of electronic documents as well as on testing the application. Marcus displayed a couple of screens from the actual software product to illustrate the method of searching for and then purchasing a document. He anticipates a spring debut for the sale of documents using the pricing approved by AJC.

The implementation of the eBench product, aiSmartBench, in Pima Superior Court, the initial location, is progressing well. Marcus reminded members of the judges' design objectives for the system and showed a couple of screens that judges would use. Kent Batty mentioned that the initial connections between SmartBench and Pima internal systems have been made. Kent elaborated the early challenges overcome in the 30-week project. Marcus indicated that discussions are underway about use of aiSmartBench by appellate court judges.

BLACKBERRY EXIT STRATEGY

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl discussed a potential new security policy to control access to the court network by employee-owned mobile devices in the wake of BlackBerry service being discontinued at AOC. He stated that employee access to calendar and e-mail information can take either of two forms. One access method (Outlook Web Access) is highly protected and the other (Exchange ActiveSync) brings the risk of trusted mobile devices functioning as backdoors the court network. The bottom line is that ActiveSync use requires certain security policies to reside on the employee's mobile device. Stewart added that no usage policy exists today for the ActiveSync connections that have already been assigned over the years, so a reset is necessary.

The policy would apply to court employees statewide, some of whom are using BlackBerries today. Karl explained his rationale for bringing a network security policy, which his organization typically determines, to a statewide governance body before implementation. Karl acknowledged an additional need to delineate when a court-owned device would be given to an employee to use and when an employee would instead use a personally owned device for work activities. The chair urged members to review the policy carefully before considering it for approval at the February meeting.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Hon. Scott Bales

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, the chair entertained a motion to adjourn at 2:35 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| February 14, 2014 | AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B |
| June 6, 2014 | AOC – Conference Room 1119 A/B |

MEETING ADJOURNED

2:35 PM